

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/712,324	RIEL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Daniel P. Stephenson	3672	

All Participants:
Status of Application: allowed

 (1) Daniel P. Stephenson.

(3) _____.

 (2) Charles Gunter.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 21 June 2006
Time: 3:00
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1, 16

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called the attorney for the applicant to change claim 1 so as to make the claim allowable over the prior art and further the prosecution of the case. It was noted that Claim 1 was a drill string assembly for allowing dual circulation for "any subsurface drilling", however there were elements of the claim that pertained to the bending of the outer tubular. This would only occur in Directional drilling. The examiner requested that the applicant change the terms "any subsurface drilling" to --directional drilling--. This would clarify it over dual wall drill strings that were used for substantially vertical drilling. The applicant agreed to this change. The examiner also noted that there were errors with the drawings that needed to be corrected before the issue fee would be paid. The attorney agreed to the drawing changes as well. Also, The dependancy of claim 16 was in error, as it was dependant from claim 15 which was previously cancelled. The attorney agreed to change the dependancy of claim 16 to claim 1.